

Appl. No. 10/709,511
Amendment dated October 9, 2006
Docket No. 7945-1

Remarks

The foregoing proposed amendment presents amended claims 1, 2, 4, 5-7, 12, 16 and 17. Claims 3 and 15 have been cancelled. As a result of this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-17 remain in the application. Allowance of remaining claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8, 12, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1606476 to Mauborgne et al ("Mauborgne").

The Examiner also rejected claims 4-7, 9-11, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mauborgne in view of Filipovic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6184844).

Before further discussion on the cited art, the Applicant wants to remind the Examiner of the claimed embodiments as amended herein. As a representative claim, claim 1 now recites a an antenna structure comprised of a multifilar helix antenna etched on a flexible substrate and substantially parallel and substantially concentric metallic rings fixed or positioned around the longitudinal axis of the helix antenna and along at least one of a total length or a partial length of the helix antenna, wherein the substantially concentric metallic rings are parasitically coupled to the multifilar helix antenna.

Mauborgne fails to suggest, mention or contemplate the use of a multifilar helix antenna etched on a substrate further including substantially parallel and substantially concentric rings around the helix antenna where the rings are parasitically coupled to the multifilar helix antenna. Instead, Mauborgne teaches a wave coil "A" having two open-looped "sliders" that appear to clamp on to the wave coil. These sliders are not permanently fixed or etched. The wave coil of Mauborgne is not a multifilar helix antenna and is not an antenna etched on a flexible substrate. The substantially parallel and substantially concentric closed looped rings as recited in some of the claims are not the open looped sliders of Mauborgne. Thus, Mauborgne fails to anticipate claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-17 and therefore the Applicant respectfully believes such claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Mauborgne.

The Examiner introduces Filipovic for the teaching of a flexible substrate with rings. One import factor that the Examiner fails to note is that Filipovic does not have parasitically coupled rings. In fact, Filipovic teaches away from parasitically coupled rings and teaches rings that short the helices of helical antenna. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Filipovic to use shorted rings with a wave coil as shown in Mauborgne and nor is there a suggestion in

Appln. No. 10/709,511
Amendment dated October 9, 2006
Docket No. 7945-1

Mauborgne to use a flexible circuit. In fact, flexible circuits or flex circuit or flexible substrate were not likely known at the time of Mauborgne, thus Mauborgne does not remote suggest, mention or contemplate anything like what the Applicant has claimed in any of the independent claims.

Thus, for all the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 4-14, and 16-17 are novel and non-obvious and overcome the rejection based Mauborgne in view of Filipovic under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

An indication of allowability is respectfully requested. Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

October 9, 2006
Date

/Pablo Meles/
Pablo Meles
Registration No. 33,739
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Tel: 954-759-8959